

of Italy," opened the first DiCicco's Restaurant in Fresno. The brothers were famous for their sing-alongs with Italian songs played on the jukebox in their restaurant. Eventually, they would be accompanied by their younger brother, Paul, and would cook into the stomachs and sing into the hearts of the people of Fresno. In 1958, Nicola returned to Italy to marry his wonderful wife, Anna Vitucci. Ten years later, the DiCicco family opened their second restaurant in Fresno and then expanded to nearby Clovis.

DiCicco family members now operate 18 restaurants in Fresno, Clovis, Madera, Santa Clara, Sacramento, Hanford, Visalia and one in Colorado. In addition, the family has spun off several other well-known local restaurants, including Vitucci's, Fratelli's, LaRocca's, Ovidio's, and Giulia's. Mr. DiCicco is survived by his wife of 44 years, Anna; his mother, Maria DiCicco; his sons: Pasquale, Giuliano, Vittorio, and Enrico; four sisters: Lucia Santeufemia, Josephine LaRocca, Giulia Paolilli, and Rosaria Defendis; three brothers: Paul, Frank, and Roberto; and seven Grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nicola DiCicco for the contribution of his many restaurants, for sharing the great cuisine of Italy with the community, and for the warm atmosphere which he and his family have provided in their restaurants for numerous years. I invite my colleagues to join me in recognizing Nicola, and in wishing his family many years of continued success.

NO ABORTIONS ON OVERSEAS MILITARY BASES

HON. W. TODD AKIN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 2003

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House Armed Services Committee (HASC) the majority of my colleagues and I rejected a proposal by one of the Committee's members to permit abortions on military bases overseas.

This proposal would have turned our overseas military bases into abortion clinics. This would not only be wrong, but would also be a prime example of wasteful spending for political gain.

The proposed amendment to the Armed Services authorization bill would have changed a Department of Defense (DoD) policy that has been in place since 1996, and before that, from 1988 to 1993, which prohibits using DoD funds for abortions, except when necessary to save the life of the mother or in cases of rape or incest.

The amendment follows the same flawed logic as President Clinton's executive order which overturned this policy in 1993 and allowed abortions to take place at military medical facilities. During the years that the executive order was in place, the DoD was not only unsuccessful in identifying obstetricians and gynecologists stationed overseas who would perform abortions, but the number of abortions actually provided during those years was very small.

Some of my colleagues argue for this amendment based on a perceived "necessity" for safe abortions at overseas military bases. However, this "necessity" does not exist. Even

if this amendment were to have been adopted, DoD policy would still prohibit military doctors from performing abortions in those countries where abortion is restricted or not permitted.

Also, in most overseas locations where legal abortions are not available, military beneficiaries have the option of using space-available travel to return to the U.S. or travel to another overseas location for the purpose of obtaining an abortion just as do other service personnel and their family members who desire other elective procedures.

This amendment would also go against the DoD's official position on this policy. The Department opposes changing the policy for a number of reasons. First, it would involve the military in performing abortions for family planning purposes. Also, a change is not needed and is not considered to be necessary to protect the health of women in or affiliated with the armed forces overseas. Lastly, this change would create an assumption that practitioners adequately familiar with and willing to perform abortion services are available in overseas military facilities, which may not be true.

This amendment not only violates the spirit of the Hyde amendment, which prohibits federal funding of abortions, but it also would encourage a very dangerous precedent of providing federal funds for elective procedures. The non-elective exemptions for abortions in cases of rape, incest or when the life of the mother is at risk are already in place and no further expansion is needed. Consequently, the use of tax-payer dollars for an elective procedure will only lead to a slippery slope of fiscal irresponsibility and soaring healthcare costs.

The House has defeated this amendment every year since 1996, and we defeated it again last evening in the Armed Services Committee. We have done so for the sound reasons I mentioned above, and I applaud my HASC colleagues for their good judgment and unwillingness to diminish the sanctity of life at the nation's overseas military bases.

IN HONOR OF THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VENTURA COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 2003

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the brave men and women who, during the past 75 years, have dedicated their lives to the service of others as members of the Ventura County Fire Department.

The Ventura County Fire Department has changed dramatically since May 11, 1928, when 277 voters went to the polls and 230 voted to form the department. Ventura County then was mostly rural and populated by ranchers and farmers. Wildfires were the primary concern. In 1928 the county experienced six house fires, but 2,820 acres of wildlands burned. The Fire Department's budget was \$20,000. Its first equipment was a Ford truck equipped with a portable pump and 1,000 feet of hose.

The county has been blessed through the years by attracting visionary Fire Chiefs, from Walter Emerick in 1928 to Bob Roper today. Together they built a fire department worthy of envy.

During its first decade, the Fire Department built 10 new fire stations situated throughout the county. In the years following World War II the department instituted a building program to modernize some stations, adopted the County Civil Service Retirement Plan and appointed the first battalion chiefs.

In the 1950s and 1960s, firefighting methods were updated, and the latest protective equipment, tools and fire engines were obtained. In the 1970s, a central Dispatch Communications Center was established and the Ventura County Public Safety Aviation Unit was formed. A hazmat trailer and suburban command modules for battalion chiefs were added in the 1980s.

The 1990s were a buzz of activity: The Department's computerized Incident Reporting System was developed and implemented, the communication center was designed and centralized, and a state-of-the-art Training Center and new fire stations were built.

But the best equipment is useless without highly trained and qualified fire fighters who put their lives on the line time and again to protect the residents of Ventura County. The Ventura County Fire Department currently employs 549 professional and dedicated men and women, 417 of whom are in uniform. Together, they protect 865 square miles and more than 450,000 people in Ventura County.

But their dedication does not stop at Ventura County's borders. In the aftermath of September 11, 2001, a number of Ventura County firefighters volunteered to go to New York City to help with recovery efforts. They have joined their colleagues from other jurisdictions to battle wildfires across the United States again and again.

Mr. Speaker, I know many of Ventura County's firefighters and I can personally attest to their bravery, their professionalism, and their dedication to protecting the lives and property of their neighbors. I know my colleagues will join me in congratulating the Ventura County Fire Department on its 75th anniversary and in thanking its brave men and women for a job well done.

IN HONOR OF DR. AND MRS. JOHN W. PACE

HON. DAVID SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 2003

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Dr. John W. Pace faithfully serves as Pastor of Red Oak United Methodist Church in Stockbridge, Georgia. Pastor Pace, affectionately known as "Big Daddy", is a native of the state Georgia. He is married to the lovely First Lady, Reba Pace. They have eight children, eleven grandchildren and one great-grandchild. Pastor Pace has one brother who is also a minister/pastor.

Dr. Pace and First Lady Pace came to Red Oak U.M.C. in 1989 from Golden United Methodist Church in Douglasville, GA. Upon their arrival, they were truly united in God's mission and as a result of much hard work, many prayers and many sacrifices made under his fine leadership, the "New" Red Oak was built along with the Christian Life Center.

Certainly, Red Oak U.M.C. has served all congregation members and many others

under the leadership of its pastor Dr. Pace and his lovely wife. They continue to work diligently as they serve others. I commend them at this celebration of their over 14 years of service to Red Oak United Methodist Church, and I encourage congregation members and friends to join in their appreciation celebration as Dr. and Mrs. Pace continue in their mission.

REGARDING LEGISLATIVE WALK-OUT (TEXAS STATE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES) MAY 14, 2003

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 2003

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker I rise to commend the Texas Legislators who staked their political careers on demanding the legislature cease work on a national Republican Party map that would override voters' choices in Congress, re-mapping the state by congressional district just one year after a federal court did the job for them.

Redistricting is a serious constitutional matter; it is not a childish "do-over" when it does not meet your partisan whims. I appreciate the leadership of Jim Solis (D-Brownsville), Rene Oliveira (D-Brownsville), Jaime Capelo (D-Corpus Christi), and Juan Escobar (D-Kingsville) and thank them for their unique patriotism. They are doing a very hard thing and the good people of South Texas appreciate their position.

In a democracy, voters should choose their representatives; representatives should never choose voters. Drawing congressional district lines is an exercise that is mandated once a decade by our constitution. We did this last year; a federal court drew new lines for Congressional districts, and each member of this body from Texas ran in those districts and won elections. To redistrict again, one year later, is unconscionable.

These members of the Texas State Legislature have done an incredibly courageous thing by leaving the state to force the House Republicans to abandon their plans to gerrymander the state of Texas' in Washington's Republican-driven redistricting effort. This effort is part of a national effort across the country, with Colorado also being a target of national meddling in the business of State Legislatures.

I commend these legislators, particularly my South Texas friends, who have the commitment and bravery to take the politically dangerous position of leaving the state Capitol in the midst of the session, a highly extraordinary move borne of a highly extraordinary national political grab. By denying the quorum, they are protecting the rights guaranteed to Texans in the Constitution.

These legislators are being criticized for their actions, yet it is the national Republican leadership that put these events in motion and they are the ones who can end it so Texans can get back to the urgent business of balancing our budget, reforming insurance rates, re-financing education reform, and economic development around the state.

Were it not for high-level, unapologetic tinkering in the state's business, the state legislators would now be working on the issues

upon which they were elected to pursue. As it is, the only members now hard at work on substantive budgetary matters are the Democrats working out of Oklahoma trying to persuade the national republican leadership to pull the redistricting bill so they can proceed.

The legislators are fighting for open participation in government and redistricting, which is precisely the vision our forefathers had when they founded this country.

I commend the political courage of the legislators who staked their careers on the principle of democratic process and one person-one vote.

CROSS-STRAIT RELATIONS: PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE

HON. STEVE CHABOT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 14, 2003

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, C.J. (Chien-Jen) Chen, Taiwan's ambassador to the United States, in an address to the Foreign Policy Research Institute in Philadelphia earlier this year, spoke on the important issue of "Cross-Strait Relations: Past, Present, Future." I know my colleagues will be interested in reading the ambassador's abridged remarks, which I include in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE C.J. (CHIEN-JEN) CHEN AT THE FOREIGN POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE—JANUARY 16, 2003

I know that the most pressing international issues at the moment involve Iraq and North Korea and that, in contrast, cross-strait relations appear to be quite tranquil. But, I am also sure that you know cross-strait relations are highly sensitive. Both now and for the foreseeable future, cross-strait relations directly affect not only Taiwan but also U.S. interests in the Western Pacific and peace and security in the entire region. So, this is a topic that merits further discussion.

Of course, to understand where cross-strait relations stand at present and to see where they might stand in the future, one must know something about the historical background of Taiwan's relationship vis-a-vis the Chinese mainland.

I. THE PAST

Over the course of the last four centuries, Taiwan has been transformed from a neglected backwater and unsettled frontier into a prosperous modern democracy of 23 million people. During this time, control over the island has passed through the hands of a succession of masters: indigenous tribes, Dutch colonizers, Han Chinese pioneers, Manchu officials, Japanese imperialists . . . In 1945, the island reverted to Chinese control under the Republic of China government. But just four years later, in a tragic twist of fate, China itself was divided by a Civil War into two parts: the free and capitalistic ROC on Taiwan and the tightly controlled and authoritarian People's Republic of China on the Chinese mainland. Throughout the Cold War, the two sides faced each other across the narrow Taiwan Strait in a tense confrontation marked by enmity, rancor, and distrust. For the past 16 years, my government has been working to break the impasse and facilitate reconciliation with the other side. In some respects, we have made much progress. In others, we have met with disappointment.

For the sake of brevity, I will not delve into all the twists and turns of Taiwan's fas-

cinating history. But, I do want to point out that several factors and historical truths continue to influence cross-strait relations today and will likely shape them in the future.

First, Taiwan is situated on China's strategic periphery at the very nexus of international trade routes that crisscross East Asia. The Taiwan Strait, which is as narrow as 90 nautical miles in some places, is the only geophysical feature separating Taiwan from the Chinese mainland.

Second, the vast majority of people on Taiwan are Han Chinese whose ancestors arrived in Taiwan at different times over the course of the last four centuries. They share many ancestral, historic, cultural and linguistic ties with the people across the strait.

Third, owing to their geographical proximity and cultural affinity, economic exchanges between Taiwan and the Chinese mainland have been nearly unavoidable and usually beneficial to both sides.

Fourth, owing to that fact that Taiwan and the Chinese mainland were united for less than five years in the 20th century and the fact that the PRC regime on the mainland has never ruled Taiwan even for a single day, distinct political, economic, and social systems have developed on each side.

Fifth, the long separation has also produced on either side of the Taiwan Strait different values, perspectives, visions, and even identities.

Sixth, cross-strait relations are dynamic, fluid, malleable. Taiwan's relationship to the Chinese mainland has changed a number of times in the past, is not static at present, and will likely evolve in the future. It is our hope that the relationship will change for the better.

II. THE PRESENT

That certainly was the motivation of our government, which, in 1987, sensed that the time had come to break the impasse between the two sides of the Taiwan Strait by allowing veterans on Taiwan to visit their relatives on the Chinese mainland. In the years following, private exchanges (i.e., travel, mail, phone calls) between the people on both sides have grown enormously as have indirect trade and investment. Along the way, our government unilaterally declared the end of hostilities against the Chinese mainland (1991) and amended ROC laws to recognize that, at present, our jurisdiction covers the Taiwan area only. Just as significantly, both sides of the Taiwan Strait set up liaison agencies to discuss practical issues arising from the various forms of interaction across the Taiwan Strait.

Now let us take a look at current developments—both positive and negative—in the relationship.

Positive

To give you a sense of the scope of that interaction, allow me to cite a few statistics. In addition to exchanging millions of phone calls and letters with people on the mainland, residents of Taiwan have, over the last 16 years, made nearly 27 million trips there, including more than 3 million trips in 2002. And during these trips to the mainland, they have spent roughly 30 billion U.S. dollars. At the same time, thanks to the gradual relaxation of our policy regarding visits from the people of the mainland, they have been able to make 817,000 short trips to Taiwan in the last few years.

Bilateral trade has surpassed 272 billion U.S. dollars since 1987. In just the first nine months of 2002, two-way trade between Taiwan and the mainland rose 26 percent over the same period the year before to 25 billion dollars.

The number of Taiwan-based businessmen investing in mainland China has also risen